

SEASIDE, CALIF.  
NEWS-SENTINEL

Weekly - 2,750

Front Page Edit Page Other Page 13

Date: JUN 4 1964

CPYRGHT

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

CPYRGHT

We reprint the following article from an edition of the San Francisco Chronicle and the following letter from reader Wilfred Smith without any other comment than to say this newspaper continues to maintain its policy of printing its readers comments.

We only wish we could have four or five pages of comment from the public every week for then we would without doubt serve one of the basic functions of a newspaper — the provoking of thought.

The Chronicle article:  
INTERNATIONAL  
The Defector

U. S. congressional sources, anxious to launch an all-out investigation of the State Department, had apparently leaked the information.

And in a sensational copy-righted story, the New York Journal-American last week reported that the 41-year-old

Pole, who defected from a Soviet Intelligence ring six years ago, had given the U. S. crucial espionage information which the State Department had all but ignored.

A former member of the top Soviet Security Agency, KGB, the Polish defector, now known by the pseudonym of Michael Goleniewski, had allegedly made the following disclosures:

\* "Soviet agents had been able to infiltrate every American embassy in important cities abroad, and every U. S. agency except the FBI (including the Central Intelligence Agency).

\* "Approximately \$1.2 million of CIA funds in Vienna recently was passed secretly along to the Communists — one-third to the Italian Communist party, and one-third to the American Communist party.

\* "Little, if anything, had been done to run down or clean out the KGB men on American payrolls, though Goleniewski had fed the facts and exposures to the CIA."

With the story out, high Government sources last week conceded Goleniewski's existence, describing him as a "valuable defector" who had turned over substantial information on Soviet bloc. The Smith letter:  
P. O. Box 5742  
Carmel, California  
May 19, 1964.

Sir: Some time ago there was a letter in your paper complaining about the emasculation of a letter sent to the Monterey Herald. Having heard many similar complaints, I should like to add my two cents worth.

"The enclosed clipping appeared in the Chronicle and as I believed that it should be read by every thinking and taxpaying American, I sent it to the Herald with that comment only, about March 1st.

"I waited ten days, then sent them a polite letter asking them when they would print it. No answer so waited another 10 days, then wrote another letter. This third

letter was answered by Mr. Woolfenden who said that diligent search had failed to find the clipping or either of my previous letters, nor had anyone seen them.

"I procured another copy of the interview and sent it to Mr. Woolfenden personally, registered, return receipt signed by addressee only.

"I waited another 10 days and finally received a reply from Mr. Woolfenden. You guessed it. The notices from the post office were lost too. Nothing arrived but the "Final Notice" which, if ignored, would have meant that the letter would have been returned to me as undeliverable.

"In explanation Mr. Woolfenden wrote that it was not the policy of their paper to comment on articles in other papers — they preferred to rely on their "Own" wire agencies. As the Herald has no wire services of its own exclusively and uses the same services as the other papers this seemed rather silly.

"I will close with a quote from the editorial "News Comments" which appears on the front page of their paper, and which I have seen quoted more than once.

"We have often said that newspapers fight for the right of the people to know-not for the right of the newspaper to know."

"The Herald knew" about this article — why wouldn't people? Draw your own conclusion.  
Wilfred Smith